



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,002	11/24/2003	Jean-Emile Elien	MSFT-2752/302033	5648
41505	7590	05/17/2006	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			CAO, PHUONG THAO	
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/721,002	Applicant(s) ELIEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/24/2003</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 11/24/2003.
2. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 11/24/2003 has been received and considered by the Examiner. A copy of the reviewed IDS is enclosed with this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 is non-statutory as software per se. Claim 1 is a "system" claim but recites no hardware to support a tangible embodiment.

Regarding claim 21, the “computer-readable medium” is not limited to tangible media in accordance with Applicant’s specification (see page 5), which states that it may be modulated data signal, not in and of itself a tangible medium. Note that amending claim 21 to recite -- computer storage medium -- would overcome this rejection.

Claims 2-12 are being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 1 upon which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zou et al. (“Web-Based Specification and Integration of Legacy Services”, IBM Press: 2000).

As to claim 1, Zou et al. teach:

“A system for providing a standardized adapter framework” (see Abstract and [page 3, column 2, paragraph 2-3]), comprising:

“a configuration user interface module for receiving a configuration schema describing configuration information” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 2-3] and [page 2, column 2, paragraph 2] wherein Web-based interface as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration user interface module”);

“a metadata utility for receiving at least one metadata file providing data interface information and service description information” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein the service management module is equivalent to Applicant’s “metadata utility” and “description information in XML form” is equivalent to Applicant’s “metadata file”); and

“generating from the configuration schema and the metadata file a configuration file and a service selection file required by an adaptor to connect to an application” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 2] and [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein service description or XML encoded service interface description is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration file”, “table to index the service ID and the corresponding XML service description” is equivalent to Applicant’s “service selection file”, and the service description is used to access to a software service [page 8, column 1, paragraph 3]; also see [page 4, column 2, paragraph 3] and [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2-4]).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the configuration schema comprises a XML schema” (see [page 2, column 2, paragraph 2], [page 5, column 2, paragraph 1] and Fig. 4).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one metadata file comprises a WSDL file” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein service description information in XML form is equivalent to WSDL file since WSDL is defined as an XML format to describe network services; also see [page 5, column 1, paragraph 1] and Fig. 4).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one metadata file comprises an XML schema” ([page 9, column 2, paragraph 4] and Fig. 11 wherein XML interface representation is equivalent to Applicant’s “metadata file comprises an XML schema”; also see Fig. 6).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising a data store for storing the configuration file” (see [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein “XML encoded service interface description” or “XML document” is

Art Unit: 2164

equivalent to Applicant's "configuration file" and database is equivalent to Applicant's "data store").

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

"further comprising a data store for storing the service selection file" (see [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2 wherein database is equivalent to Applicant's "data store" and "table to index the service ID and the corresponding XML service description" is equivalent to Applicant's "service selection file").

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

"wherein the configuration file is an XML file" (see [page 2, column 2, paragraph 2] and [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein XML document including configuration information [page 6, column 1, paragraph 1] is equivalent to Applicant's "configuration file").

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein a unified user interface is generated from the configuration schema and the at least one metadata file” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein available facts and the DTD of each fact as disclosed [also see page 5] equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration schema and the at least one metadata file”).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein information entered via the unified user interface is stored in the configuration file” (see [page 7] wherein the service description is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration file” since it configures how to access to services, and the disclosure of the service description generated automatically from the information provided by the user is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein information entered via the unified user interface is stored in the service selection file” (see [page 7] wherein “table to index the service ID and corresponding XML service description” is equivalent to Applicant’s “the service selection file”, and the disclosure of inserting service description generated from user input into the index table is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the XML schema is received from the adaptor associated with the configuration file” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein “description information in XML form” is equivalent to Applicant’s “XML schema” and CORBA IIOP via which CORBA objects can send description information and accept request as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “adaptor”).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one metadata file is received from the adaptor associated with the configuration file” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] and [column 10, column 1, paragraph 1] wherein description information in XML form including self-description information (metadata) is equivalent to Applicant’s “metadata file”).

As to claim 13, Zou et al. teach:

“A method for providing a standardized adaptor framework” (see Abstract, [page 3, column 2, paragraph 3] and [page 7, column 2, paragraph 2-3]), comprising:

“receiving a description of configuration data associated with an adaptor” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein description information is equivalent to Applicant’s “description

of configuration data” and CORBA IIOP via which CORBA objects can send description information and accept request as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “adaptor”);

“generating an adapter-specific user interface from the configuration data description” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein the user interface generated dynamically according to available facts and the DTD of each fact is equivalent to Applicant’s “adapter-specific user interface” and the DTD of each fact [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2] is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration data description”);

“receiving instance-specific data from the adaptor-specific user interface” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein selecting required facts from the interface implies the receiving of information relating to those facts as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language); and

“saving the instance-specific data and the description of configuration data in an XML file” (see [page 6, column 1, paragraph 1] and [page 7, column 1-2] wherein description facts is equivalent to Applicant’s “instance-specific data”, XML encoded service interface description or the whole XML document including independent facts as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “XML file”, and the disclosure of the ability to insert a new service description and interface to accept user input of description facts implies the saving of data as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“saving the XML file in a data store” (see [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein XML encoded service interface description is equivalent to Applicant’s “XML file” and database is equivalent to Applicant’s “data store”).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the description of configuration data is an XML schema” (see Fig. 4 and [page 5]).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising receiving information associated with data interface and service description” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] for the disclosure of the service management module receiving description information in XML form which includes interface information and service description of a software component as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the information associated with data interface and service description is a WSDL specification” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein service description information in XML form is equivalent to WSDL specification since WSDL is defined as an XML format to describe network services; also see [page 5, column 1, paragraph 1] and Fig. 4).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising receiving a message associated with an application request” (see [page 4, column 1, paragraph 3] wherein request for a servlet is equivalent to Applicant’s “message associated with an application request”).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising receiving a message associated with an application request and selecting an XML file from the data store, the XML file associated with the application request” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 3-4] and [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein service request is equivalent to Applicant’s “message associated with an applicant’s request”, and XML document must be selected from service repository to localize requested service as disclosed in [page 8, column 1, paragraph 3])).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 19 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising sending the XML file to the adaptor” [page 13, column 2, paragraph 1] wherein script encoded in XML is equivalent to Applicant’s “XML file” and this script must be sent to the adaptor of the service to invoke the service; also see [page 3, column 2, paragraph 3]).

As to claim 21, Zou et al. teach:

“A computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions” (see Abstract) for:

“receiving a description of configuration data associated with an adaptor” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein description information is equivalent to Applicant’s “description of configuration data” and CORBA IIOP via which CORBA objects can send description information and accept request as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “adaptor”);

“generating an adapter-specific property page from the configuration data description” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] and [page 5] wherein the user interface generated dynamically according to available facts and the DTD of each fact is equivalent to Applicant’s “adapter-specific property page” and the DTD of each fact [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2] is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration data description”);

“receiving instance-specific data from the property page” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein Web interface is equivalent to Applicant’s “property page” and selecting

Art Unit: 2164

required facts from the interface implies the receiving those information as illustrated in

Applicant's claim language)

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Jones et al. (Publication No US 2005/0071853) teach the creation of a user interface for the application from identified user interface template and the identified model adapter. The user interface template may define an abstract portlet, and creating a user interface includes creating a portlet instance that communicates with the application via the model adapter.

Bales et al. (Publication No US 2004/0068554) teach a web service interface which can be automatically generated, thus simplifying the development of web application. Web service configuration data can be received and proxies to access the web service can be automatically generated.

Fletcher et al. (Publication No US 2003/0055624) teach a dynamic integration of software resource using services of a content framework such as a portal platform.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PTC

May 9, 2006

Phuong-Thao Cao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167